arXiv:1609.04561v2 [math.AP] 7 Feb 2017

TOWARDS A DETERMINISTIC KPZ EQUATION WITH FRACTIONAL DIFFUSION: THE STATIONARY PROBLEM

BOUMEDIENE ABDELLAOUI AND IRENEO PERAL

Abstract. In this work we analyze the existence of solution to the fractional quasilinear problem,

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u &= |\nabla u|^p + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \\ u &> 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega \subset I\!R^N$ is a bounded regular domain ($\mathcal{C}^2$ is sufficient), $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $1 < p$ and f is a measurable nonnegative function with suitable hypotheses.

The analysis is done separately in three cases, subcritical, $1 < p < 2s$, critical, $p = 2s$, and supercritical, $p > 2s$.

1. Introduction.

The aim of this paper is to discuss the existence of a weak solution of the following nonlocal elliptic problem, with a gradient term,

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u &= |\nabla u|^p + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \\ u &> 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset I\!R^N$ is a bounded regular domain ($\mathcal{C}^2$ is sufficient), $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $1 < p$ and f is a measurable nonnegative function. Here $(-\Delta)^s$ means the classical fractional Laplacian operator of order $2s$ defined by

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) := a_{N,s} \text{ P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x - y|^{N+2s}}\, dy,\ s \in (0, 1), \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$a_{N,s} := 2^{2s-1} \pi^{-\frac{N}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{N+2s}{2})}{|\Gamma(-s)|},$$

is the normalization constant to have the identity

$$(-\Delta)^s u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(|\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F} u),\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, s \in (0, 1),$$

in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the class of Schwartz functions.

Our goal is to find *natural* conditions on f in order to obtain the existence of positive solution.

The problem (1.1) can be seen as a Kardar-Parisi-Zhang stationary equation with fractional diffusion. See [27] for the derivation of the model in the local case.

In this sense, since the model KPZ assume the growth of the interface in the direction of the its normal, it is natural to assume $s > \frac{1}{2}$.

Key words and phrases. fractional diffusion, nonlinear gradient terms, stationary KPZ equation

Mathematics Subject Classification:MSC 2010: 35B65, 35J62, 35R09, 47G20.

This work is partially supported by project MTM2013-40846-P, MINECO, Spain.

The local problem was widely studied by many authors, see for instance [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [23], [25], [2], [18], [19] and the references therein. The recent paper [24] gives a deep analysis of the stochastic case. They consider precisely the case $p \leq 2$ (subcritical and critical growth). The existence of solution is obtained using *a priori* estimates, that are proved using suitable test functions, and comparison principles. In the last three references some sharp regularity results are obtained and, as a consequence, the authors are able to prove the characterization of the solutions and, as a consequence, a *wild* non uniqueness result.

The supercritical case, $p > 2$, has been studied, for instance, in the references [25], [35] and [34]. The existence of solution is obtained using Potential Theory and some fixed point arguments. Of course, in any case, the existence results are guaranteed under regularity hypotheses on f and smallness condition on λ.

The aim of this article is the analysis of the nonlocal case. We refer to [26, 39] for some physical motivations and results for the corresponding evolutionary problem.

There are significative differences with the local case. First at all it is necessary to identify the critical growth in the fractional setting. By homogeneity, the critical power seems to be $p = 2s$ and in fact, this is the threshold to use the comparison techniques when $q < 2s$. It is worthy to point out that in a such critical growth there is not known a change of variables similar to the Hopf-Cole change in the local case. Moreover the techniques of nonlinear test functions, in general, are difficult to adapt in the nonlocal problem.

One of the main tools in our analysis are sharp estimates on the Green function of the *fractional laplacian* obtained in [12]. Some interesting results by using such estimates, appear in the papers by Chen-Veron [15] and [16]. They consider nonlinearities with $p < p_* := \frac{N}{N-2s+1}$ and obtain sharp existence results for f a Radon measure.

We will concentrate to cover the range $p \geq p_*$, it seems that the argument used in [15, 16] can not be extended directly to this range and then we need to use a different approach. To deal with the subcritical case $p < 2s$, we will prove a new comparison principles in the spirit of [3] [36]. This comparison result allow us to prove the existence and the uniqueness of *nice* solution to problem (4.1). In the case $q < p_*$, we are able to prove the uniqueness of solution for all datum in L^1. The techniques based on the comparison principe has a serious limitation in the critical and supercritical cases, that is, for $p \geq 2s$, such difficulties drive us to only get a super-solution when we start from an ordered family of approximated problems in order to solve the problem (1.1). To overcame the lack of compactness, we will use estimates from potential theory and we will apply fixed point argument inspired from the papers [35] and [34] in the local case.

The paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2 we begin by some basic results about problem with general datum in L^1 or in the space of Radon measures. As it was observed in the local case, existence of solution to problem (1.1) is strongly related to the regularity of the solution to problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v & = & f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{1.3}$$

In this section we will also precise the sense in which the solutions are understood and, for $s > \frac{1}{2}$, we will establish the regularity of the solution v to problem (1.3) according to the regularity of the datum f. In Section 3 we state the comparison principe to be used in the subcritical case. The proof relies on a Harnack type inequality of the fractional operator perturbed by a first order linear term. Once obtained the comparison principle, we are able to prove existence and uniqueness results for approximated problems and to obtain the uniqueness result for the problem studied in [16], that is, for $p < p_*$. Problem (1.1) with $p < 2s$ is treated in Section 4. The proof of existence

of solution uses the comparison principe and the construction of a suitable supersolution and, as in the local framework, the existence of a solution will be guaranteed under additional hypotheses on f and smallness condition on λ. The compactness argument used in this section can not be used to treat the critical and the supercritical cases, for this reason the analysis of these two cases will be performed in Section 5 by using suitable estimates from Potential Theory and the classical Schauder fixed point theorem. Finally, in the last Section we collect some open problems that seem to be interesting to solve.

2. Preliminaries and auxiliary results.

In this section we present some useful results about the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s v = \nu & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where ν is a bounded Radon measure. We give some definitions about the set of Radon measures and the sense in which a solution to problem (2.1) is considered (see [15] and [16]).

Definition 1. *Let μ be a bounded Radon measure and $\beta > 0$. We say that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega, d^\beta)$ if*

$$\int_\Omega d^\beta(x) d|\mu| < +\infty,$$

with $d(x) = dist(x, \partial\Omega)$.

In the same way, if f is a locally integrable function, then $f \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega, d^\beta)$ if

$$\int_\Omega |f(x)| d^\beta(x) dx < +\infty.$$

It is clear that if $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, then $f \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega, d^\beta)$ for all $\beta > 0$.

Next we precise the sense in which solutions are defined for this general class of data.

Definition 2. *We say that u is a weak solution to problem (2.1) if $u \in L^1(\Omega)$, and for all $\phi \in \mathbb{X}_s$, we have*

$$\int_\Omega u(-\Delta)^s \phi dx = \int_\Omega \phi d\nu,$$

where

$$\mathbb{X}_s \equiv \Big\{ \phi \in \mathcal{C}(I\!R^N) \,|\, supp(\phi) \subset \overline{\Omega},\ (-\Delta)^s \phi(x) \text{ is pointwise defined and } |(-\Delta)^s \phi(x)| < C \text{ in } \Omega \Big\}.$$

The functional framework to obtain solution to truncated problem is the fractional Sobolev space given in the next definition. See [17] and [29].

Definition 2.1. *For $0 < s < 1$, we define the fractional Sobolev space of order s as*

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} dxdy < +\infty \}.$$

We define now the space $H_0^s(\Omega)$ as the completion of $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm of $H^s(I\!R^N)$. Notice that if $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$, we have $u = 0$ a.e. in $I\!R^N \setminus \Omega$ and we can write

$$\int_{I\!R^N} \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} \, dx \, dy = \iint_{D_\Omega} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{N+2s}} \, dx \, dy$$

where

$$D_\Omega := I\!R^N \times I\!R^N \setminus \left(\mathcal{C}\Omega \times \mathcal{C}\Omega \right).$$

Definition 3. *For $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ we define*

$$T_k(\sigma) = \max(-k, \min(k, \sigma)) \quad \text{and} \quad G_k(\sigma) = \sigma - T_k(\sigma).$$

From [29] and [1] the following result holds.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, then problem (2.1) has a unique weak solution u that is obtained as the limit of $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the sequence of the unique solutions to the approximating problems*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s u_n & = & f_n(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n & = & 0 & \text{in } I\!R^N \backslash \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{2.2}$$

with $f_n = T_n(f)$. Moreover,

$$T_k(u_n) \to T_k(u) \text{ strongly in } H_0^s(\Omega), \quad \forall k > 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$u \in L^q, \qquad \forall\, q \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-2s}\big) \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\big|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u\big| \in L^r, \qquad \forall\, r \in \big(1, \frac{N}{N-s}\big). \tag{2.5}$$

Remarks 2.3. *In [1], the more general framework of the fractional p-Laplacian operator with nonnegative datum is studied. The uniqueness of nonnegative solution in the entropy setting is proved. Since in this work we are considering the linear case $p = 2$, then existence and uniqueness of weak solutions are obtained without any sign condition on the datum.*

Let $\mathcal{G}_s$ be the Green kernel of $(-\Delta)^s$, using a probabilistic approach the authors in [10], [11] and [12] prove the next estimates on $\mathcal{G}_s$ and its gradient.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then*

$$\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \le C_1 \min\{\frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-2s}}, \frac{d^s(x)}{|x-y|^{N-s}}, \frac{d^s(y)}{|x-y|^{N-s}}\}, \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| \le C_2 \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \max\{\frac{1}{|x-y|}, \frac{1}{d(x)}\}. \tag{2.7}$$

In particular

$$|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| \le \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-2s+1}}.$$

As a consequence of the estimates in Lemma 2.4, the authors in [16] obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and let $f \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$, a Radon measure. Then the problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v & = & f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{2.8}$$

has a unique weak solution in the sense of Definition 2 such that,

1. *$|\nabla v| \in M^{p_*}(\Omega)$, the Marcinkiewicz space, with $p_* = \frac{N}{N-2s+1}$ and as a consequence $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for all $q < p_*$. Moreover*

$$||v||_{W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)} \le C(N, q, \Omega)||f||_{\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.9}$$

(2) *For $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, setting $T : L^1(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$, with $T(f) = v$, then T is a compact operator.*

Remark 1. *If $f \in L^1(\Omega, d^\beta)$ with $0 \le \beta \le s$, then for $p \in (1, \frac{N}{N+\beta-2s})$ there exists $c_p > 0$ such that*

$$||u||_{W^{2s-\gamma,p}} \le ||f||_{L^1(\Omega,d^\beta)},$$

where $\gamma = \beta + \frac{N}{p'}$ if $\beta > 0$ and $\gamma > \frac{N}{p'}$ if $\beta = 0$.

We will use Theorems 2.2 and 2.5 as a starting point of our analysis.

2.1. **Some classical inequalities.** We recall two results involving Riesz potentials that will be used.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $0 < \lambda < N$, $1 \le p < l < \infty$ be such that $\frac{1}{q} + 1 = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\lambda}{N}$. For $g \in L^p(I\!R^N)$, we define*

$$J_\lambda(g)(x) = \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{g(y)}{|x-y|^\lambda} dy.$$

a) J_λ is well defined in the sense that the integral converges absolutely for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.
b) If $p > 1$, then $||J_\lambda(f)||_q \le c_{p,q}||f||_p$.
c) If $p = 1$, then $|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \, |J_\lambda(f)(x) > \sigma\}| \le \big(\frac{A||f||_1}{\sigma}\big)^l$.

See for instance Section 1.2 of Chapter V in [38] for the proof. We will use also the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $0 < \lambda < N$, $\theta, \gamma > 1$ with $\frac{1}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{\lambda}{N} = 2$. Assume that $g \in L^\theta(I\!R^N)$ and $k \in L^\gamma(I\!R^N)$, then*

$$\Big| \iint_{I\!R^N \times I\!R^N} \frac{g(x)k(y)}{|x-y|^\lambda} dxdy \Big| \le C(N,\lambda,\theta)||k||_{L^\gamma(I\!R^N)}||g||_{L^\theta}.$$

For the proof we refer, for instance, to Section 4.3 in [31] or to the paper [30].

2.2. **A technical result.** In what follows we will assume that $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$.

In the local case, $s = 1$, if v is the solution to the corresponding problem (2.8), it is known that $T_k(v) \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ for all $k > 0$. This follows using $T_k(v)$ as a test function in (2.8). To prove a similar result in the fractional setting in the next subsection we need the following result.

Lemma 2.8. *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain. Assume $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\alpha \in I\!R$ verifying $1 < \alpha < 2s$. Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s \rho &= \dfrac{1}{d^\alpha(x)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

has a positive solution ρ such that $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\rho^\beta \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ for all $\beta > \max\{\frac{s}{2s-\alpha}, 1\}$.

Proof. Recall that Ω is a regular domain, since $s > \frac{1}{2}$, the following Hardy type inequality was obtained in [32],

$$C\int_\Omega \frac{\phi^2}{d^{2s}(x)}dx \le ||\phi||^2_{H^s_0(\Omega)} \text{ for all } \phi \in H^s_0(\Omega), \tag{2.11}$$

where $C > 0$ depend only on s, N and Ω.

Define ρ_n to be the unique solution to the approximating problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s \rho_n &= \dfrac{1}{d^\alpha(x) + \frac{1}{n}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho_n &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

It is clear that $\rho_n \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H^s_0(\Omega)$, $\rho > 0$ in Ω and $\rho_n \le \rho_{n+1}$ for all n.

Since $\alpha < 2s$, we can pick-up $\beta > 1$ such that $\alpha < \dfrac{2s\beta}{\beta+1}$.

Taking ρ_n^β as a test function in (2.12) and by using the numerical inequality,

$$(a-b)(a^\gamma - b^\gamma) \ge c|a^{\frac{1+\gamma}{2}} - b^{\frac{1+\gamma}{2}}|^2 \text{ for all } a, b \in I\!R^+ \text{ and } \gamma > 0, \tag{2.13}$$

(see [28]), it follows that

$$C||\rho_n^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}||^2_{H^s_0(\Omega)} \le \int_\Omega \frac{\rho_n^\beta}{d^\alpha(x)}dx. \tag{2.14}$$

Thus using the Hölder inequality, it holds

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\rho_n^\beta}{d^\alpha(x)}dx \le \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{\rho_n^{\beta+1}}{d^{2s}(x)}dx\Big)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}} \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{d^{(\beta+1)(\alpha-\frac{2s\beta}{\beta+1})}(x)}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}.$$

Notice that, since $\alpha < \dfrac{2s\beta}{\beta+1}$, then $(\beta+1)(\alpha - \dfrac{2s\beta}{\beta+1}) < 0$,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{d^{(\beta+1)(\alpha-\frac{2s\beta}{\beta+1})}(x)}dx < \infty.$$

Therefore, by the Hardy inequality (2.11),

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\rho_n^\beta}{d^\alpha(x)}dx \le C\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{\rho_n^{\beta+1}}{d^{2s}(x)}dx\Big)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}} \le C||\rho_n^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}||^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}}_{H^s_0(\Omega)}. \tag{2.15}$$

Hence, from (2.14) and (2.15), we have $||\rho_n^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}||_{H^s_0(\Omega)} \le C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there exists ρ such that $\rho^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \in H^s_0(\Omega)$, $\rho_n \uparrow \rho$ strongly in $L^{\frac{2^*_s(\beta+1)}{2}}(\Omega)$ and $\rho_n^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} \rightharpoonup \rho^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}$ weakly in $H^s_0(\Omega)$.

It is not difficult to show that ρ is a solution to problem (2.10) in the sense of distribution and that $\dfrac{\rho_n^{\beta+1}}{d^\alpha(x)} \to \dfrac{\rho^{\beta+1}}{d^\alpha(x)}$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega)$. In the same way we can show that $\rho \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for all $\sigma > 0$.

To prove that $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we follows [29] where the classical Stampacchia argument in [37] is adapted to the fractional setting. For the reader convenience we give some details, mainly the estimates involving the Hardy inequality .

Take $G_k^\beta(\rho_n))$, with $k>0$, as a test function (2.12). Notice that by using (2.13), we have

$$(\rho_n(x)-\rho_n(y))\big(G_k^\beta(\rho_n)-G_k^\beta(\rho_n)\geq C|G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}(\rho_n(x))-G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}(\rho_n(y)|^2,$$

then,

$$\begin{aligned} C\int\int_{D_\Omega}\frac{|G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\rho_n(x)-G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\rho_n(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dxdy &\leq \int_\Omega\frac{G_k^\beta(\rho_n(x))}{d^\alpha(x)}dx\\ &\leq \Big(\int\limits_\Omega\frac{G_k^{\beta+1}(\rho_n)}{d^{2s}(x)}dx\Big)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}}\Big(\int_{A_k}d^{(\beta+1)(\frac{2s\beta}{\beta+1}-\alpha)}(x)dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n\to\infty$ it follows that

$$\int\int_{D_\Omega}\frac{|G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\rho(x)-G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}\rho(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}\,dxdy\leq\Big(\int\limits_\Omega\frac{G_k^{\beta+1}(\rho)}{d^{2s}(x)}dx\Big)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}}|A_k|^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}},$$

where $A_k=\{x\in\Omega:|u(x)|\geq k\}$. Hence by Hardy inequality,

$$||G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}(\rho)||^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}_{H_0^s(\Omega)}\leq C|A_k|^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}},$$

and by using the Sobolev Inequality, there results that

$$S||G_k^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}(\rho)||_{L^{2_s^*}(\Omega)}\leq C|A_k|.$$

Let $h>k$, since $A_h\subset A_k$, we obtain that

$$(h-k)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}|A_h|^{\frac{1}{2_s^*}}\leq C|A_k|,$$

that is,

$$|A_h|\leq\frac{C|A_k|^{2_s^*}}{(h-k)^{\frac{2_s^*(\beta+1)}{2}}}.$$

Since $2_s^*>1$, by the classical numerical lemma by Stampacchia in [37], there exists a $k_0>0$ such that $|A_h|=0$ for all $h\geq k_0$. Thus ρ is bounded. □

2.3. **Some regularity results.** We start by proving the following regularity result of $T_k(v)$ that will be a useful tool in the subsequent arguments.

Theorem 2.9. *Assume that $f\in L^1(\Omega)$ and define v to be the unique weak solution to problem (2.8), then $T_k(v)\in W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)\cap H_0^s(\Omega)$ for any $1<\alpha<2s$, moreover*

$$\int\limits_\Omega|\nabla T_k(v)|^\alpha\leq Ck^{\alpha-1}||f||_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $f\geq 0$. By Theorem 2.2, $T_k(v)\in H_0^s(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{G}_s$ be the Green kernel of $(-\Delta)^s$, then

$$v(x)=\int\limits_\Omega\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)f(y)(y)dy. \tag{2.16}$$

Thus

$$|\nabla T_k(v)|=|\nabla v(x)|\chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}}\leq\Big(\int\limits_\Omega|\nabla_x\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|f(y)dy\Big)\chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}}.$$

Fix $1<\alpha<2s$, then using Hölder inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla T_k(v)|^\alpha &\leq \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| f(y)dy\Big)^\alpha \chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}} \\
&\leq \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|}{\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)} \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y)dy\Big)^\alpha \chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}} \\
&\leq \Big(\int_\Omega \Big[\frac{|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|}{\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}\Big]^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y)dy\Big)\Big(\int_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y)dy\Big)^{\alpha-1} \chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}} \\
&\leq \Big(\int_\Omega \Big[\frac{|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|}{\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}\Big]^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y)dy\Big) u^{\alpha-1}(x) \chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}} \\
&\leq k^{\alpha-1}\Big(\int_\Omega \Big[\frac{|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|}{\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}\Big]^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y)dy\Big) \chi_{\{|v(x)|<k\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From [10] and [14], we know that

$$\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \leq C_1 \min\Big\{\frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-2s}}, \frac{d^s(x)}{|x-y|^{N-s}}, \frac{d^s(y)}{|x-y|^{N-s}}\Big\},$$

and

$$|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| \leq C_2 \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \max\Big\{\frac{1}{|x-y|}, \frac{1}{d(x)}\Big\}.$$

Thus, setting $h(x,y) = \dfrac{|\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)|}{\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}$, we reach that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(v)|^\alpha dx \leq k^{\alpha-1} \int_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int_\Omega h(x,y)^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)dx\Big)dy.$$

It is clear that $h(x,y)^\alpha \leq C\Big(\frac{1}{|x-y|^\alpha} + \frac{1}{d^\alpha(x)}\Big)$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(v)|^\alpha dx &\leq Ck^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha'}}\Big\{\int_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^\alpha}\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)dx\Big)dy + \int_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)dx\Big)dy\Big\} \\
&\leq Ck^{\alpha-1}(I_1+I_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Respect to I_1, using the fact that $\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-2s}}$, it holds

$$I_1 \leq C\int_\Omega f(y)\int_\Omega \Big(\frac{1}{|x-y|^\alpha}\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)dx\Big)dy \leq C\int_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}}dx\Big)dy.$$

Since $\alpha<2s$, then, for $R >> 2\text{diam}\,(\Omega)$,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}}dx \leq \int_{B_R(y)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}}dx \leq CR^{2s-\alpha}.$$

We deal now with I_2. Consider ρ, the unique solution to problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s \rho = \dfrac{1}{d^\alpha(x)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

obtained in Lemma 2.8. Since $\alpha < 2s$, by Lemma 2.8, $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Thus

$$I_2 \leq C \int_\Omega f(y) \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) dx \Big) dy = C \int_\Omega f(y) \rho(y) dy \leq C ||f||_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Combining the above estimates, it follows that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla T_k(v)|^\alpha dx \leq C k^{\alpha - 1} ||f||_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Hence we conclude. □

We next precise some results in order to find the regularity of v when f is assumed to be more regular.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m \geq 1$ and define v to be the unique solution to problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v & = & f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{2.17}$$

with $s > \frac{1}{2}$. Then for all $p < \frac{mN}{N - m(2s-1)}$, there exists a positive constant $C \equiv C(\Omega, N, s, p)$ such that

$$||\nabla v||_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}. \tag{2.18}$$

Moreover,

1. *If $m = \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then $|\nabla v| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p < \infty$.*
2. *If $m > \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then $v \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.*

To prove the previous Lemma, we need the following elementary result.

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that the same hypotheses as above hold. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^1(\Omega)$ and define ψ to be the unique solution to problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s \psi & = & \dfrac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{2.19}$$

then for $\beta < \dfrac{N}{2s-1}$ and for all $r < \frac{\beta N}{N - \beta(2s-1)}$, there exists a positive constant $C \equiv C(N, \beta, r, \Omega)$ such that

$$||\psi||_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq C ||\phi||_{L^\beta(\Omega)}. \tag{2.20}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G}_s$ be the Green kernel of $(-\Delta)^s$, then

$$\psi(x) = \int_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y_i}(y) dy.$$

Hence, using an integration by part,

$$|\psi(x)| \leq \int_\Omega |\frac{\partial \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}{\partial y_i}| |\phi(y)| dy.$$

By using Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequalities in Lemma 2.7, and since

$$|\frac{\partial \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}{\partial y_i}| \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|^{N-2s+1}}$$

(see Lemma 2.4 above), it follows that

$$||\psi||_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq C||\phi||_{L^\beta(\Omega)},$$

where $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{N-2s+1}{N} - 1$. Hence we conclude. □

Notice that if $\beta \nearrow \frac{N}{2s-1}$ then $r \to \infty$. We are now able to prove Lemma 2.10.

Proof of Lemma 2.10. As a consequence of Theorem 2.5 (see [16]) we have that $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for all $q < p_*$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^1(\Omega)$, then

$$\langle \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1}, \phi \rangle = -\int_\Omega v \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y_1} dy$$

Hence, if ψ is the solution of problem (2.19), it follows that

$$|\langle \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1}, \phi \rangle| = |\int_\Omega v(-\Delta)^s \psi dy| = |\int_\Omega f\psi dy|$$

Thus, using Hölder inequality,

$$|\langle \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1}, \phi \rangle| \leq ||f||_m ||\psi||_{m'},$$

and by Lemma 2.11, setting $r = m'$, we reach that

$$|\langle \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1}, \phi \rangle| \leq C||f||_m ||\phi||_\beta \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{N-2s+1}{N} < 1 + \frac{1}{m'}.$$

Therefore, by duality, $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1} \in L^{\beta'}(\Omega)$ and

$$||\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1}||_{L^{\beta'}(\Omega)} \leq C||f||_{L^\beta(\Omega)}.$$

Since $m' < \frac{\beta N}{N-\beta(2s-1)}$, then $\beta' < \frac{pN}{N-p(2s-1)}$ and the result follows. It is clear that if $m = \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then we can take β' any positive constant and then $|\nabla v| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p < \infty$.

We prove now the point 2).

Notice that if $m > \frac{N}{2s-1}$ then $|\nabla v| \in W^{2s-\gamma-1,l}(\Omega)$ where $0 < \gamma < 2s-1$ and $(2s-\gamma-1)l > N$.

Indeed, we proceed with similar duality arguments to those in the proof of Theorem 2.5 in [15]. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\Omega)$, then

$$|\int_\Omega \phi(-\Delta)^s v dx| = |\int_\Omega f\phi dx| \leq ||f||_{L^m} ||\phi||_{L^{m'}}.$$

Putting $l = \frac{Nm}{N-\gamma m}$ with $\gamma \in [0,1]$ is such that $\gamma < \min\{(2s-1), \frac{N}{m}\}$, then $m' = \frac{l'N}{N-l'\gamma}$. It is clear that $\frac{N}{2s-1} < m < l$.

Now, using the definition of q and by Sobolev inequality, it follows that

$$|\int_\Omega \phi(-\Delta)^s v dx| \leq ||f||_{L^m} ||\phi||_{L^{\frac{l'N}{N-l'\gamma}}} \leq C||f||_{L^m} ||\phi||_{W_0^{\gamma,l'}(\Omega)}$$

Thus $(-\Delta)^s v \in W^{-\gamma,l}(\Omega)$ and

$$||(-\Delta)^s v||_{W^{-\gamma,l}(\Omega)} \leq C||f||_{L^m}.$$

Recalling that $(-\Delta)^s$ realize an isomorphism between $W^{2s-\gamma,l}(\Omega)$ and $W^{-\gamma,l}(\Omega)$, hence we conclude that $v \in W^{2s-\gamma,l}(\Omega)$ and

$$||v||_{W^{2s-\gamma,l}(\Omega)} \leq C||f||_{L^m}.$$

Since $2s-\gamma > 1$, then $|\nabla v| \in W^{2s-\gamma-1,l}(\Omega)$. Now, using the definition of l, we reach easily that $(2s-\gamma-1)l > N$. Thus by the fractional Morrey inequality, $|\nabla v| \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ whit $\alpha = \frac{N}{(2s-\gamma-1)l}$ and

$$||v||_{\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)} \leq C||f||_{L^m}.$$

□

3. Comparison principle and applications

In this section we will prove a comparison principle that extend the one proved in [3] in the local case. More precisely, we will prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *(Comparison Principle). Let $g \in L^1(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative function. Assume that for all $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$,*

$$H : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ verifies } |H(x,\xi_1) - H(x,\xi_2)| \leq Cb(x)|\xi_1 - \xi_2|$$

where $b \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for some $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$. Consider w_1, w_2 two positive functions such that $w_1, w_2 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p < p_*$, $(-\Delta)^s w_1, (-\Delta)^s w_2 \in L^1(\Omega)$, $w_1 \leq w_2$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ and

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w_1 \leq H(\nabla w_1) + g & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (-\Delta)^s w_2 \geq H(\nabla w_2) + g & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Then, $w_2 \geq w_1$ in Ω.

In order to prove Theorem 3.1 we will follow the arguments used by Porretta in [36] for differential equations and for that we need some results on problems with first order term.

In first place the following Harnack inequality proved in [12].

Proposition 3.2. *(Harnack inequality). Assume that $B \in (L^\sigma(\Omega))^N$ with $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$ and let $w \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative function in $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

$$(-\Delta)^s w - \langle B(x), \nabla w \rangle = 0 \text{ in } B_R$$

with $B_R \subset\subset \Omega$. Then

$$\sup_{B_R} w \leq C \inf_{B_R} w$$

where $C \equiv C(\Omega, B_R)$.

3.1. A uniqueness result for a related problem.

We prove the following uniqueness result.

Lemma 3.3. *Let B be a vector field in Ω. Assume that $B \in (L^\sigma(\Omega))^N$ with $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$ and let w be a solution to the problem*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w = \langle B(x), \nabla w \rangle & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

with $|\nabla w| \in M^{p_*,\infty}(\Omega)$, the Marcinkiewick space, then $w = 0$.

Proof. We claim that $w \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

We divide the proof of the claim into two steps:

FIRST STEP. Suppose that $|\nabla w| \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m = \frac{N\sigma}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}$, then setting $h(x) = |\langle B(x), \nabla w\rangle|$ and taking into account the regularity of B, it follows that $h \in L^{\frac{N}{2s-1}}(\Omega)$. Going back to (3.2) and by the first point in Lemma 2.10, we conclude that $|\nabla w| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p < \infty$. Thus $h \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$. Since $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$, by the second point in Lemma 2.10, we conclude that $|\nabla w| \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and the result follows.

SECOND STEP. We prove the regularity result of the first step, namely that $|\nabla w| \in L^{\frac{N\sigma}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}}(\Omega)$.

We will use a bootstrapping argument.

Since $|\nabla w| \in M^{p_*}(\Omega)$, then $h \in L^{l_1}(\Omega)$ for $1 < l_1 < \dfrac{p_*\sigma}{\sigma + p_*}$. Fix l_1 as above, then using Lemma 2.11, it follows that $|\nabla w| \in L^{r_1}(\Omega)$ with $r_1 = \dfrac{l_1 N}{N - l_1(2s-1)}$. Hence by the Hölder inequality we conclude that $h \in L^{l_2}(\Omega)$ with $l_2 = \dfrac{r_1\sigma}{\sigma + r_2}$. Using again Lemma 2.11 , it follows that $|\nabla w| \in L^{r_2}(\Omega)$ with $r_2 = \dfrac{l_2 N}{N - l_2(2s-1)}$.

It is clear that $r_2 > r_1$. Define by iteration the sequence $\{r_n\}_n$ by

$$r_{n+1} = \frac{N\sigma r_n}{N\sigma - r_n(\sigma(2s-1) - N)}.$$

If for some n_0, $r_{n_0} \geq \dfrac{\sigma N}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}$, then the result follows.

We argue by contradiction. Assume that $r_n < \frac{\sigma N}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}$ for all n. It is easy to show that $\{r_n\}_n$ is an increasing sequence. Hence there exists $\bar{r}$ such that $r_n \uparrow \bar{r} \leq \frac{\sigma N}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}$. Thus $\bar{r} = \frac{N\sigma\bar{r}}{N\sigma - \bar{r}(\sigma(2s-1)-N)}$, hence $\bar{r} = 0$, a contradiction with the fact that $\{r_n\}_n$ is an increasing sequence.

Therefore there exists a n_0 such that $r_{n_0} \geq \frac{\sigma N}{(2s-1)\sigma - N}$ and the claim follows.

Let us prove now that $w \leq 0$. If by contradiction, $C = \max_{x\in\Omega} w(x) > 0$, then there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $w(x_0) = C$. We set $w_1 = C - w$, then $w_1 \geq 0$ in $I\!R^N$, $w_1(x_0) = 0$ and

$$(-\Delta)^s w_1 - B(x)\nabla w_1 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Consider $B_R = B_r(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega$. By applying the Harnack inequality in Proposition 3.2 to w_1, we conclude that $\sup_{B_r(x_0)} w_1 \leq C(\Omega, B_r) \inf_{B_r(x_0)} w_1 = 0$. Thus $w_1 \equiv 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$. Since Ω is a bounded domain, then, applying Harnack inequality a finite number of steps, we prove that $w_1 = 0$ in Ω. Thus $C \leq 0$ and then $w \leq 0$.

The linearity of the problem permits to apply similar arguments to $-w$ (is also a solution to (3.2)), that is, we reach that $w \equiv 0$ and the result follows. □

3.2. **Existence for an auxiliary problem.** Let us prove now the following existence result for an auxiliary problem.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $B \in (L^{\sigma_1}(\Omega))^N$ with $\sigma_1 > \frac{N}{2s-1}$ and $0 \leq f \in L^{\sigma_2}(\Omega)$ with $\sigma_2 > \frac{N}{2s}$, then the problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s w & = & \langle B(x), \nabla w\rangle + f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.3}$$

has a unique nonnegative bounded solution w such that $|\nabla w| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p < \infty$. In addition, if $\sigma_2 > \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then $\nabla w \in (\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}(\Omega))^N$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Proof. It is clear that the regularity of the solution follows using the same iteration argument as in the proof of the regularity result in Lemma 3.3. Let us prove the existence part.

Fix $p < p_*$ be such that $p' < \sigma_1$ and define the operator $T : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by setting $w = T(u)$ where w solves

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s w & = & \langle B(x), \nabla u_+ \rangle + f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{3.4}$$

Since $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, then the existence and the uniqueness of w follows by using approximating argument and the results of [16]. It is clear that if w is a fixed point of T, then w is a nonnegative solution to (3.3). To show that T has a fixed point, we will use the Schauder fixed point theorem (see Theorem 11.3 in [22]).

From the result of [16], we conclude that T is a compact operator.

We claim that there exists $M > 0$ such that it $u = \lambda T(u)$ with $\lambda \in [0,1]$, then $||u||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq M$.

To prove the claim we argue by contradiction.

Assume that there exists sequences $\{\lambda_n\} \subset [0,1]$ and $\{u_n\}_n$ such that $u_n = \lambda_n T(u_n)$ and $||u||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Define $v_n = \dfrac{u_n}{||u_n||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}}$, then $||v_n||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = 1$ and v_n solves

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v_n & = & \langle B(x), \nabla (v_n)_+ \rangle + \lambda_n \dfrac{f}{||u_n||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_n & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{3.5}$$

It is clear that $v_n \geq 0$ and $||\langle B(x), \nabla (v_n)_+ \rangle||_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C$, thus

$$||v_n||_{W_0^{1,l}(\Omega)} < C(l) \text{ for all } l < p_*$$

and

$$||\nabla v_n||_{W_0^{2s-1-\gamma,l}(\Omega)} \leq C \text{ for all } l < p_* \text{ with } \gamma = \frac{N}{l}.$$

Up to a subsequence, we find that $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $W_0^{1,l}(\Omega)$ for all $l < p_*$, $v \in W_0^{1,l}(\Omega)$, $v \geq 0$ and v solves

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v & = & \langle B(x), \nabla v \rangle & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right.$$

From Lemma 3.3 we obtain that $v = 0$ and from the compactness result of [16] we obtain that $v_n \to v$ strongly in $W_0^{1,l}(\Omega)$ for all $l < p_*$, in particular for $l = p$ and then $||v||_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = 1$ which is a contradiction. Hence the claim follows.

Thus T has a fixed point and then problem (3.3) has a nonnegative solution.

The uniqueness immediately follows. Indeed, if w_1 and w_2 are two solution to problem (3.3), then $\tilde{w} = w_1 - w_2$ solves

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s \tilde{w} & = & \langle B(x), \nabla \tilde{w} \rangle & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \tilde{w} & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we know that $\tilde{w} = 0$, thus $w_1 = w_2$. □

Remark 2. *We are able to prove the existence result in Lemma 3.4 without the positivity condition on f, in fact, consider w_1 and w_2 the solutions to problem* (3.3) *with datum f_+ and f_- respectively. Setting $w = w_1 - w_2$, then w solve*

$$(-\Delta)^s w = \langle B(x), \nabla w \rangle + f \text{ in } \Omega,$$

with the same regularity.

A remarkable result derives of the following observations.

Since $s > \frac{1}{2}$, we set $E = W^{2s,2}(\Omega) \cap H_0^s(\Omega)$. Then if $w \in E$, it holds that $|\nabla w| \in W^{2s-1,2}(\Omega)$, hence $|\nabla w| \in L^{\frac{2N}{N-2(2s-1)}}(\Omega)$. By hypothesis $B \in (L^{\sigma_1}(\Omega))^N$ with $\sigma_1 > \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then $|\langle B(x), \nabla w\rangle| \in L^2(\Omega)$ for all $w \in E$.

Define $L(w) = (-\Delta)^s w - \langle B(x), \nabla w\rangle$; then

$$L : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega), \text{ with } Dom(L) = E.$$

By Lemma 3.3 we have that $Ker(L) = \{0\}$. Thus $L^{-1} : L^2(\Omega) \to E$ is a well defined compact operator. Therefore by the Fredholm alternative theorem we conclude that for all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, the problem (3.4) has a unique solution $u \in E$.

Now, observe that for $u, v \in E$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle L(u), v\rangle &= \int_\Omega (-\Delta)^s u\, v dx - \int_\Omega \langle B(x), \nabla u\rangle v \\
&= \int_\Omega u(-\Delta)^s v dx - \int_\Omega \mathrm{div}(B(x)v) u dx \\
&= \int_\Omega u\Big((-\Delta)^s v - \mathrm{div}(B(x)v)\Big) u dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by defining

$$K(v) = (-\Delta)^s v - \mathrm{div}(B(x)v),$$

then we have,

$$\langle K(v), u\rangle = \langle v, Lu\rangle,$$

that is K is the adjoint operator of L. Since $0 = \dim \mathrm{Ker}(L) = \dim \mathrm{Ker}(K)$, then for all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ the problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v - \mathrm{div}(B(x)v) &=& f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &=& 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.6}$$

has a unique solution $u \in E$. In particular, using the same regularity techniques as in Lemmas 2.11, and 3.3, we find the following consequence.

Corollary 3.5. *For all $f \in L^{\sigma_2}(\Omega)$ with $\sigma_2 > \frac{N}{2s}$, there exists a unique solution v to problem* (3.6) *with $|\nabla v| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p < \infty$. If $f \geq 0$, then $v \geq 0$.*

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.** We are now able to prove the comparison principle in Theorem 3.1.

Consider $w = w_1 - w_2$, then $w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p < p_*$ and $(-\Delta)^s w \in L^1(\Omega)$.

We have just to show that $w^+ = 0$. It is clear that $w \leq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. By (3.1), it follows that

$$(-\Delta)^s w \quad \leq \quad H(x, \nabla w_1) - H(x, \nabla w_2) \leq b(x)|\nabla w|.$$

Now, using Kato's inequality (see for instance [29]) we get

$$(-\Delta)^s w_+ \leq b(x)|\nabla w_+|, \qquad w_+ = \max\{\mathrm{w}, 0\} \in \mathrm{W}_0^{1,\mathrm{q}}(\Omega) \text{ for all } \mathrm{q} < \mathrm{p}_*. \tag{3.7}$$

Let v be the unique positive bounded solution to problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s v + \mathrm{div}(\mathcal{F}(x)v) &=& 1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v &=& 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(x)=\begin{cases} b(x)\dfrac{\nabla w_+(x)}{|\nabla w_+(x)|} & \text{if } |\nabla w_+(x)|\neq 0\\ 0 & \text{in } |\nabla w_+(x)|=0.\end{cases}$$

Taking v as a test function in (3.7), it follows that

$$\int\limits_\Omega (-\Delta)^s w_+ v dx \leq \int_\Omega b(x)|\nabla w_+(x)|v(x)dx.$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_\Omega (-\Delta)^s w_+ v dx &= \int\limits_\Omega w_+(-\Delta)^s v dx\\ &= \int\limits_\Omega w_+(-\mathrm{div}\mathcal{F}(x)v)dx+\int\limits_\Omega w_+ dx\\ &= \int_\Omega b(x)|\nabla w_+(x)|v(x)dx+\int\limits_\Omega w_+ dx.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\displaystyle\int\limits_\Omega w_+\leq 0$ and then $w\leq 0$ in Ω. Thus we conclude. □

As a byproduct of the previous result we obtain the following uniqueness results.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $g\in L^1(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative function. Suppose that $q\geq 1$ and $a>0$, then the problem*

$$\begin{cases}(-\Delta)^s w &= \dfrac{|\nabla w|^q}{a+|\nabla w|^q}+g & \text{in } \Omega,\\ w &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega,\end{cases}\tag{3.9}$$

has a unique nonnegative solution w such that $w\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p<p_*$ and $T_k(w)\in H_0^s(\Omega)\cap W^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha<2s$.

Corollary 3.7. *Consider the problem*

$$\begin{cases}(-\Delta)^s w &= |\nabla w|^q+\lambda g & \text{in } \Omega,\\ w &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega,\end{cases}\tag{3.10}$$

with $1<q<p_*$ and $g\in L^1(\Omega)$, $g\geq 0$. Then there exist λ^* such if $\lambda<\lambda^*$, problem (3.10) has a unique positive solution w such that $w\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p<p_*$ and $T_k(w)\in H_0^s(\Omega)$ for all $k>0$.

Proof. The existence and regularity can be seen in [16]. We prove the uniqueness. Indeed if w_1 and w_2 are two positive solution to problem (3.10) with the above regularity, defining $\bar{w}=w_1-w_2$, then $(-\Delta)^s\bar{w}\in L^1(\Omega)$, $\bar{w}\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p<p_*$, $T_k(\bar{w})\in H_0^s(\Omega)$ for all $k>0$ and

$$(-\Delta)^s\bar{w}\leq H(x,\nabla w_1)-H(x,\nabla w_2)\leq b(x)|\nabla\bar{w}|$$

where $b(x)=q\Big(|\nabla w_1|+|\nabla w_2|\Big)^{q-1}$ and since $q<p_*$ then $q'>p_*'$, that is $b\in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for some $\sigma>\frac{N}{2s-1}$. Thus using the comparison principle in Lemma 3.1, we conclude that $\bar{w}_+=0$. In the same way and setting $\widehat{w}=w_2-w_1$, we obtain that $\widehat{w}_+=0$. Thus $w_1=w_2$. □

4. The subcritical problem: Existence results via comparison arguments.

In this section we consider the problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll}(-\Delta)^s u &=& |\nabla u|^q + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega,\\ u &=& 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,\\ u &>& 0 & \text{in } \Omega,\end{array}\right. \tag{4.1}$$

where $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $q < 2s$ and $f \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for some convenient $\sigma > 1$. The main goal of this section is to show that, under additional hypotheses on f, we are able to build a suitable supersolution and then the comparison principles in Theorem 3.1 allows us to use a monotony argument in order to prove the existence of a minimal positive solution.

Remark 3. *Notice that in the local case, the existence of a solution is guaranteed under the condition*

$$\inf_{\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla \phi|^{q'} dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega f|\phi|^{q'} dx} > 0. \tag{4.2}$$

By using the spectral theory, it is clear that the above condition holds if $f \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for some $\sigma > \frac{N}{q'}$.

4.1. **A radial supersolution.** We will star by building a radial supersolution with the required regularity.

Define $w(x) = (1 - |x|^\alpha)_+$ where $1 < \alpha < 2s$. Since w is a radial function and by using the results in [20], it follows that

$$(-\Delta)^s w(x) = r^{-2s} \int_1^\infty \left((w(r) - w(\sigma r)) + (w(r) - w(\frac{r}{\sigma}))\sigma^{2s-N} \right) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma$$

where $r = |x|$ and H is a continuous positive function defined in $[1, \infty)$ with $H(\sigma) \backsimeq \sigma^{2s}$ as $\sigma \to \infty$. Fix $r < r_0 < 1$ to be chosen later, then

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta)^s w(x) &= r^{-2s} \int_1^{\frac{1}{r}} \left(r^\alpha(\sigma^\alpha - 1) + r^\alpha(\frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha} - 1)\sigma^{2s-N} \right) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma\\ &+ r^{-2s} \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^\infty \left((1 - r^\alpha) + r^\alpha(\frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha} - 1)\sigma^{2s-N} \right) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma\\ &= r^{\alpha-2s} \int_1^{\frac{1}{r}} (\sigma^\alpha - 1)(1 - \sigma^{2s-N-\alpha}) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma\\ &+ r^{\alpha-2s} \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^\infty \left((\frac{1}{r^\alpha} - 1) - (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha})\sigma^{2s-N} \right) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma\\ &= r^{\alpha-2s} F(r)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}F(r) &= \int_1^{\frac{1}{r}} (\sigma^\alpha - 1)(1 - \sigma^{2s-N-\alpha}) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma\\ &+ \int_{\frac{1}{r}}^\infty \left((\frac{1}{r^\alpha} - 1) - (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha})\sigma^{2s-N} \right) \sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s} H(\sigma) d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $F(r) \geq C(r_0) > 0$ for all $r \in (0, r_0)$. By a direct computation we find that $F'(r) < 0$, hence to conclude, we have just to show that $F(r_0) \geq C(r_0)$ for suitable $r_0 < 1$.

Notice that $(\sigma^\alpha - 1)(1 - \sigma^{2s-N-\alpha})\sigma(\sigma^2 - 1)^{-1-2s}H(\sigma) > 0$ for all $\sigma > 1$. On the other hand we have $(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha})\sigma^{2s-N} \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_0^\alpha})\sigma_0^{2s-N}$ where $\sigma_0 = (\frac{N+\alpha-2s}{N-2s})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. Thus for $\sigma > \frac{1}{r}$ we have

$$(\frac{1}{r^\alpha} - 1) - (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha})\sigma^{2s-N} \geq (\frac{1}{r^\alpha} - 1) - (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_0^\alpha})\sigma_0^{2s-N}.$$

Defining $r_0 \equiv \left(\frac{N+\alpha-2s}{N+\alpha-2s+\sigma_0^{2s-N}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} < 1$, for $r \leq r_0$ and $\sigma \geq \frac{1}{r}$, it holds that

$$(\frac{1}{r^\alpha} - 1) - (1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^\alpha})\sigma^{2s-N} \geq 0.$$

Combining the above estimate we reach that $F(r) \geq C(r_0) > 0$ for all $r \leq r_0$. Notice that $|\nabla w| = \alpha|x|^{\alpha-1}\chi_{\{|x|<1\}}$. Since $1 < \alpha < 2s$, setting $w_1 = Cw$ for some $C > 0$, we obtain that w_1 satisfies

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s w_1 & \geq & |\nabla w_1|^q + \lambda\dfrac{1}{|x|^{2s-\alpha}} & \text{in } B_r(0), \\ w_1 & \geq & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r(0), \\ w_1 & > & 0 & \text{in } B_r(0), \end{array}\right. \tag{4.3}$$

for some $\lambda > 0$.

It is clear that, modulo a rescaling argument, the above construction holds in any bounded domain.

In the case $p_* < q < 2s$, we can guess a positive supersolution in the form

$$S(x) = A|x|^{-\alpha}, \quad A, \quad 0 < \alpha < N - 2s.$$

By direct calculation we obtain

$$(-\Delta)^s S(x) = C_{N,s}(\alpha)A|x|^{-\alpha-2s}, \quad C_{N,s}(\alpha) > 0,$$

and $|\nabla S(x)| \leq A\alpha|x|^{-(\alpha+1)}$.

Therefore to have a radial solution in the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$, the following identity must be verified,

$$C_{N,s}(\alpha)|x|^{-\alpha-2s} \geq \alpha^q A^{q-1}|x|^{-(\alpha+1)} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

that is, necessarily $\alpha = \dfrac{2s-q}{q-1}$ and the condition $q < 2s$ appears in a natural way.

Hence, it is sufficient to pick-up A such that $\alpha^q A^{q-1} \leq C_{N,s}(\alpha)$.
If the source term $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then we just have to chose $\lambda > 0$ small enough in order to have a supersolution S in Ω.

Since $q > \frac{N}{N-2s+1} \equiv p_*$, then $S \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and any translation $\tilde{S}(x) = S(x - x_0)$ is also a supersolution, thus choosing $x_0 \in I\!R^N \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, $\tilde{S}(x)$ is a bounded supersolution.

4.2. **A first result on existence of weak solution.** Thus we have the next existence result.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let w be a bounded supersolution to (4.1) such that $w \in W^{1,q}_0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then problem (4.1) has a solution u such that $w \in W^{1,\alpha}_0(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$.*

Proof. Let u_n be the unique solution to the approximating problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s u_n & = & \dfrac{|\nabla u_n|^q}{1 + \frac{1}{n}|\nabla u_n|^q} + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array}\right. \tag{4.4}$$

By the comparison principle in Theorem 3.1, it follows that $u_n \leq u_{n+1} \leq w$ for all n. Hence, there exists u such that $u_n \uparrow u$ strongly in $L^{q^*}(\Omega)$. Let $g_n(x) = \dfrac{|\nabla u_n|^q}{1+\frac{1}{n}|\nabla u_n|^q} + \lambda f$ and define ρ to be the unique solution to the problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s \rho & = & 1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \rho & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{4.5}$$

Using ρ as a test function in (4.4) and since $u_n \leq w$, it follows that

$$\int\limits_\Omega g_n(x)\rho \leq C \text{ for all } n.$$

We claim that the sequence $\{u_n\}_n$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,a}(\Omega)$ for all $a < 2s$. We follow closely the same ideas as in the proof of Theorem 2.9. We have that

$$u_n(x) = \int\limits_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy.$$

Hence

$$|\nabla u_n(x)| \leq \int\limits_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| g_n(y) dy.$$

Fix $1 < \alpha < 2s$ and define $h(x,y) = \max\left\{\dfrac{1}{|x-y|}, \dfrac{1}{d(x)}\right\}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u_n(x)|^\alpha &\leq \Big(\int\limits_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| g_n(y) dy\Big)^\alpha \leq \Big(\int\limits_\Omega h(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)^\alpha \\ &\leq \Big(\int\limits_\Omega (h(x,y))^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)\Big(\int\limits_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)^{\alpha-1} \\ &\leq \Big(\int\limits_\Omega (h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big) u_n^{\alpha-1}(x) \\ &\leq \int\limits_\Omega \Big(h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big) w^{\alpha-1}(x) \\ &\leq \int\limits_\Omega \Big(h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) |\nabla u_n(y)|^q dy\Big) w^{\alpha-1}(x) + \lambda \int\limits_\Omega \Big(h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y) dy\Big) w^{\alpha-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int\limits_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^\alpha dx &\leq \int\limits_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int\limits_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) w^{\alpha-1}(x)\Big) dy \\ &+ \lambda \int\limits_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int\limits_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) w^{\alpha-1}(x) dx\Big) dy \\ &\equiv J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\alpha < 2s$, following the same computations as in the proof of Theorem 2.9, we reach that

$$J_1 \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)dx \Big) dy \leq C \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q dy$$

and

$$J_2 \leq C \int_\Omega f(y)dy.$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^\alpha dx \leq C_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^q dx + C_2.$$

Choosing $\alpha > q$ and by Hölder inequality, we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^\alpha dx \leq C \text{ for all } n.$$

As a consequence we get that $\{g_n\}_n$ is bounded in $L^{1+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. By the compactness result in Proposition 2.5, we obtain that, up to a subsequence, $u_n \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,r}(\Omega)$ for all $r < p_*$ and $|\nabla u_n| \to |\nabla u|$ a. e. in Ω. Hence by Vitali lemma we reach that $u_n \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$, in particular, for $\alpha = q$. Thus u is a solution to (4.1) with $u \in W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $a < 2s$. □

As a consequence of the above Theorem and the construction of the supersolution at the beginning of this subsection, we get the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Assume that $q < 2s$ and that $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $f \gneq 0$. Then there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < \lambda^*$, problem (4.1) has a bounded positive solution u such that $u \in W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$.*

4.3. **A second existence result.** Now, as in the local case, we assume that $f \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ for some $\gamma > \dfrac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$, $q' = \dfrac{q}{q-1}$. In order to obtain a solution, we need some extra condition on the supersolution. We obtain the following result.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that $f \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ for some $\gamma > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$. Let w be a nonnegative supersolution to (4.1) such that $w \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ for some $q < \sigma \leq 2s$. Suppose that the following estimate holds,*

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega} \int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma} dx \leq C. \tag{4.6}$$

Then problem (4.1) has a solution u such that $u \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ and $T_k(u) \in H_0^s(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$.

Proof. Define ψ, to be the solution to problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s \psi &= \dfrac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)}{d^\sigma(x)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

Therefore $\psi \in L^\theta(\Omega)$ for $\theta > \max\{\frac{\alpha}{q-\sigma}, \frac{N}{N-q'(2s-1)}\}$ if $q'(2s-1) < N$, i.e., $q > p_*$, and $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ if $q \le p_*$.

Let u_n be the unique solution to the approximating problem (4.4), then $u_n \le u_{n+1} \le w$ for all n. Since $w \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$, hence there exists u such that $u_n \uparrow u$ strongly in $L^{\sigma^*}(\Omega)$. As in the proof of the Theorem 4.1, setting $g_n(x) = \dfrac{|\nabla u_n|^p}{\frac{1}{n} + |\nabla u_n|^p} + \lambda f$, it follows that

$$u_n(x) = \int_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy \quad \text{ and then } |\nabla u_n(x)| \le \int_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| g_n(y) dy.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla u_n(x)|^\sigma &\le \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla_x \mathcal{G}_s(x,y)| g_n(y) dy\Big)^\sigma \le \Big(\int_\Omega h(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)^\sigma \\
&\le \Big(\int_\Omega (h(x,y))^\alpha \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)\Big(\int_\Omega \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big)^{\sigma-1} \\
&\le \Big(\int_\Omega (h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big) u_n^{\sigma-1}(x) \\
&\le \int_\Omega \Big(h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) g_n(y) dy\Big) w^{\sigma-1}(x) \\
&\le \int_\Omega \Big(h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) |\nabla u_n(y)|^q dy\Big) w^{\sigma-1}(x) + \lambda \int_\Omega \Big(h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) f(y) dy\Big) w^{\sigma-1}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^\sigma dx &\le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) w^{\sigma-1}(x)\Big) dy \\
&\quad + \lambda \int_\Omega f(y) \Big(\int_\Omega h^\sigma(x,y)\mathcal{G}_s(x,y) w^{\sigma-1}(x) dx\Big) dy \equiv J_1 + J_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $h(x,y) = \max\{\frac{1}{|x-y|}, \frac{1}{d(x)}\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x) G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma} dx\Big) dy + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x) G(x,y)}{d^\sigma(x)} dx\Big) dy \\
&\le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x) G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma} dx\Big) dy + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \psi(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the hypothesis on w, we reach that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\le C \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q dy + \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^\sigma dy\Big)^{\frac{q}{\sigma}} \Big(\int_\Omega \psi^{\frac{\sigma}{q-\sigma}} dy\Big)^{\frac{\sigma-q}{\sigma}} \\
&\le C_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q dy + C_2 \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^\sigma dy\Big)^{\frac{q}{\sigma}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For J_2, we have

$$J_2 \leq \int_\Omega f(y)\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma}dx\Big)dy + \int_\Omega f(y)\psi(y)dy.$$

Hence

$$J_2 \leq C\int_\Omega f(y)dy + \Big(\int_\Omega f^{\frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}}dy\Big)^{\frac{q'(2s-1)}{N}}\Big(\int_\Omega \psi^{\frac{N}{N-q'(2s-1)}}dy\Big)^{\frac{N-q'(2s-1)}{N}} \leq C.$$

Thus

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^\sigma dx \leq C_1\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^q dx + C_2\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^\alpha dy\Big)^{\frac{q}{\alpha}} + C_3.$$

Since $\sigma > q$, using Hölder inequality, it holds

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(x)|^\sigma dx \leq C \text{ for all } n.$$

Hence, up to a subsequence, $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$. By the compactness result in Proposition 2.5, up to a subsequence, we obtain that $|\nabla u_n| \to |\nabla u|$ a.e. in Ω. Hence by Vitali lemma, taking into account that $q < \sigma$, we reach that $u_n \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$. Thus u is a solution to (4.1) with $u \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$. Define $F \equiv |\nabla u|^q + \lambda f$, then $F \in L^1(\Omega)$, hence using Theorem 2.9 it holds that $T_k(u) \in H_0^s(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ for all $\sigma < 2s$. Hence we conclude. □

As a consequence of the Theorem 4.3, we get the following application in a concrete case.

Theorem 4.4. *Assume that $p_* < q < 2s$ and let $f(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^\theta}$ with $0 < \theta < q'(2s-1) < N$. Then there exists λ^* such that for all $\lambda < \lambda^*$, problem (4.1) has a solution u with $u \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ for $q < \sigma < \min\{\frac{N}{\theta-2s+1}, 2s\}$ and $T_k(u) \in H_0^s(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$.*

Proof. From Theorem 4.3, we have just to build a supersolution w such that $w \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ for some $q < \sigma \leq 2s$. It is clear that $f \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ for some $\gamma > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\theta > 2s$. Define $w_1(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{\theta-2s}}$, then

$$(-\Delta)^s w_1 = \frac{C}{|x|^\theta} \geq C_1(\Omega)|\nabla w_1|^q + C_2 f \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Hence setting $w = cw_1$, we reach that, for small λ,

$$(-\Delta)^s w \geq |\nabla w|^q + \lambda f \text{ in } \Omega.$$

It is clear that $w \in W^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$ for all $\beta < \frac{N}{\theta-2s+1}$. Since $q > p_*$, then $q < \frac{\theta}{\theta-2s+1} < \frac{N}{\theta-2s+1}$. Hence there exists $q < \sigma < \min\{\frac{N}{\theta-2s+1}, 2s\}$ such that $w \in W^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$. Moreover, condition (4.6) holds. Indeed,

$$\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma}dx \leq C\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha_0}}dx.$$

Since $0 < \theta < q'(2s-1)$, then we can choose $q < \sigma < 2s$ such that $\sigma < \frac{\theta}{\theta-2s+1}$. That is, $\frac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}} \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ for some $\gamma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$. Therefore, using Hölder inequality, we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma}dx \leq C\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}})^\sigma dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^{\sigma'(N-2s+\sigma)}}dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma'}}.$$

Since $\gamma'(N-2s+\sigma) < N$, then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\sigma}dx \leq C.$$

Define now ψ to be the unique solution to the problem

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s\psi & = & \dfrac{w^{\sigma-1}(x)}{d^\sigma(x)} = \dfrac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}d^\sigma(x)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{array}\right. \tag{4.8}$$

Since $(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1) < 2s$, we prove that $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Fix $B_r(0) \subset\subset \Omega$ and taking ψ_1 and ψ_2, the solutions to problems

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s\psi_1 & = & \dfrac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}d^\sigma(x)}\chi_{B_r(0)} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi_1 & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array}\right. \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s\psi_2 & = & \dfrac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}d^\sigma(x)}\chi_{\{\Omega\setminus B_r(0)\}} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \psi_2 & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{array}\right. \tag{4.10}$$

it is clear that $\psi = \psi_1 + \psi_2$. Since $(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1) < 2s$, then there exists $\sigma_1 > \frac{N}{2s}$ such that $\frac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}d^\sigma(x)}\chi_{B_r(0)} \in L^{\sigma_1}(\Omega)$. Therefore, $\psi_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Respect to ψ_2, it is clear that $\frac{1}{|x|^{(\theta-2s)(\sigma-1)}d^\sigma(x)}\chi_{\{\Omega\setminus B_r(0)\}} \leq \frac{C}{d^\sigma(x)}$. Then, since $\sigma < 2s$, using similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 2.8, we reach that $\psi_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Thus $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and the claim follows.

Hence we conclude that all conditions of Theorem 4.3 hold and therefore there exists u a solution to problem (4.1) with $u \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ and $T_k(u) \in H_0^s(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < 2s$. □

Remark 4. *We do not reach the extremal case $\alpha = 2s$. It is clear that by the previous monotonicity method we can not reach the case $q \geq 2s$. However, in the next section and using some arguments from Potential Theory we will show the existence of a solution if $q \geq 2s$.*

5. Existence result using potential theory

In this section we will complete the above existence results for all $q > p_*$. We will use some techniques from potential theory. The key is to construct a suitable supersolution using hypotheses on f that allow us to use *potential theory estimates*. In [25] the authors prove the existence of solution under potential type hypothesis on f and for any $q \geq 1$ in the local setting. The hypothesis on f is equivalent to the condition (4.2). This type of arguments was also used in [13] for $s = 1$, for some potentials instead of a gradient term.

In what follows we will assume that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$ and then according with the ideas of [13] and [25], we will build a suitable supersolution to problem (4.1) in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^N$ under natural conditions on f.

Consider the Riez potential $J_{(N-\alpha)}$ defined in Lemma 2.6. We call $I_\alpha = J_{(N-\alpha)}$, that is

$$I_\alpha(g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{g(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy.$$

Notice that if $0 < \alpha < 2$, then $I_\alpha = ((-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})^{-1}$ and $G_\alpha(x,y) \equiv \dfrac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}$ is a constant multiple of the fundamental solution associated to the operator $(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

For $f \in L^m(\Omega)$, we consider its extension by 0 to the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$, namely,

$$f_0(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if} \quad x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

If q is the exponent in the problem (4.1), we define

$$F_0(x) = \Big(I_{2s-1}(f_0)(x)\Big)^q.$$

Then the key hypothesis on f is that the inequality

$$I_{2s-1}(F_0) \le C_1 I_{2s-1}(f_0) \tag{5.2}$$

holds.

The first result of this Section is the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that the hypothesis* (5.2) *holds, then problem* (4.1) *has a positive supersolution* $\bar{u}$ *such that* $\bar{u} \in D^{1,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *where* $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)} \ge q$. *In particular* $u \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. For the precise definition of the space $D^{1,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the reader can consult Section 8.2 in [31]. Assume that (5.2) holds and define $\bar{u} = u_1 + u_2$ where u_1, u_2 solve the problems

$$(-\Delta)^s u_1 = \lambda f_0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, (-\Delta)^s u_2 = C_2 F_0(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \text{respectively.} \tag{5.3}$$

It is clear that

$$\bar{u}(x) = I_{2s}(\lambda f_0 + C_2 F_0)(x),$$

thus

$$|\nabla \bar{u}| \le (N-2s)\Big(I_{2s-1}(\lambda f_0 + C_2 F_0\Big).$$

Hence using (5.2), we reach that

$$|\nabla \bar{u}|^q \le \Big((N-2s)(\lambda + C_2 C_1\Big)^q \Big(I_{2s-1}(f_0)\Big)^q \le \Big((N-2s)(\lambda + C_2 C_1)\Big)^q F_0.$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$(-\Delta)^s \bar{u} = \lambda f_0 + C_2 F_0 \ge \lambda f_0 + \frac{C_2 |\nabla \bar{u}|^q}{\Big((N-2s)(\lambda + C_2 C_1)\Big)^q}.$$

Let $\hat{u} = a\bar{u}$, where $a = \dfrac{C_2^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}{\Big((N-2s)(\lambda+C_2C_1)\Big)^{\frac{q}{q-1}}}$, then

$$(-\Delta)^s \hat{u} \ge |\nabla \hat{u}|^q + \lambda^* f_0 \text{ with } \lambda^* = a\lambda. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $|\nabla \hat{u}| \leq C I_{2s-1}(f_0)$, $f_0 \in L^m(I\!R^N)$ with $m > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$ and $q > p_*$, by using Lemma 2.6 and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, it follows that $|\nabla \hat{u}| \in L^\gamma(I\!R^N)$ where $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)} \geq q$. Hence the result follows. □

In the next proposition we analyze the regularity of the solution $\hat{u}$ obtained above.

Proposition 1. *Let $\hat{u}$ the supersolution obtained in Theorem 5.1.*

(1) *If $m > \frac{N}{2s}$, then $\hat{u} \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$.*

(2) *If $\frac{N}{q'(2s-1)} < m \leq \frac{N}{2s}$, then $\hat{u} \in L^{\frac{mN}{N-2sm}}(I\!R^N)$, in particular for any α verifying*

$$1 < \alpha < \alpha_0 \equiv \frac{N}{N - m(2s-1)} < 2s,$$

and for any bounded domain Ω, we have

$$\sup_{\{y \in \Omega\}} \int_\Omega \frac{\hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}} dx \leq C. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. Consider u_1 and u_2 defined in the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Assume first that $m > \frac{N}{2s-1}$, then we get easily that $u_1 \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$. Since

$$F_0(x) = \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{f_0(y)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+1}} dy \Big)^q,$$

using Hölder inequality, we reach that $F_0 \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$. Moreover, as a consequence of Lemma 2.6, $F_0 \in L^1(I\!R^N)$. Thus $F_0 \in L^1(I\!R^N) \cap L^\infty(I\!R^N)$. Hence $u_2 \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$ and then the result follows in this case.

If $\frac{N}{2s} < m \leq \frac{N}{2s-1}$ then $u_1 \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$.

Respect to u_2, we have $F_0 \in L^{\gamma_1}(I\!R^N)$ with $\gamma_1 = \frac{mN}{q(N-m(2s-1)}$. A direct computation shows that for $\frac{N}{2s} < m \leq \frac{N}{2s-1}$, we have $\gamma_1 > \frac{N}{q}$.

Using again Lemma 2.6, it holds that $F_0 \in L^{\frac{2N}{N+2s}}(I\!R^N)$. Thus $F_0 \in L^\sigma(I\!R^N)$ for all $\sigma \in [\frac{2N}{N+2s}, \gamma_1]$. Hence $u_2 \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$ and then $\hat{u} \in L^\infty(I\!R^N)$.

Let consider the hypothesis (2), namely, $\frac{N}{q'(2s-1)} < m \leq \frac{N}{2s}$.

Since $|\nabla \hat{u}| \in L^\gamma(I\!R^N)$ with $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)}$, by using the Sobolev inequality we conclude that $\hat{u} \in L^{\frac{mN}{N-2sm}}(I\!R^N)$.

Let us prove now inequality (5.5). Fix $1 < \alpha < \alpha_0$ and define

$$K_1(y) = \int_\Omega \frac{u_1^{\alpha-1}(x)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}} dx \qquad \text{and} \qquad K_2(y) = \int_\Omega \frac{u_2^{\alpha-1}(x)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}} dx.$$

Using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$K_i(y) \leq \Big(\int_\Omega u_i^{(\alpha-1)\sigma}(x) dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^{(N-2s+\alpha)\sigma'}} dx \Big)^{\frac{1}{\sigma'}} \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

Since Ω is a bounded domain, then $\displaystyle\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|x-y|^{(N-2s+\alpha)\sigma'}} dx \leq C(\Omega)$ if $(N-2s+\alpha)\sigma' < N$, that means $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-\alpha}$. Since $\alpha < \alpha_0$, we can find $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-\alpha}$ such that $(\alpha-1)\sigma \leq \frac{mN}{N-2sm}$. Hence $K_1(y) \leq C(u_1, \Omega)$ for all $y \in \Omega$.

We deal now with K_2. By Lemma 2.6, we get $F_0 \in L^\theta(I\!R^N)$ for $\theta = \frac{mN}{q(N-m(2s-1))}$. Therefore, using again Lemma 2.6, we find that $u_2 \in L^{\theta_1}(I\!R^N)$ where $\theta_1 = \frac{mN}{q(N-m(2s-1))-2sm}$. Since Ω is bounded and $\alpha < \alpha_0$, we can find a σ such that $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-\alpha}$ and $\theta_1 > (\alpha-1)\sigma$. Hence

$$\int_\Omega u_2^{(\alpha-1)\sigma}(x)dx \le C.$$

Finally, as $\hat{u} = u_1 + u_2$, we conclude. □

As in [25], we can prove the following existence result.

Theorem 5.2. *Under the general hypotheses on s and q, assume that $\Omega \equiv \mathbb{R}^N$. There exists a constant C_1 depending on q and N such that if (5.2) holds with constant C_1, then there exist a positive weak solution $u \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(I\!R^N)$ to the equation*

$$(-\Delta)^s u = |\nabla u|^q + \lambda f, \quad f \ge 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Take u_1 as the solution to problem

$$(-\Delta)^s u_1 = \lambda f \text{ in } I\!R^N.$$

and define by recurrence u_{k+1} by setting

$$u_{k+1} = I_{2s}(|\nabla u_k|^q) + I_{2s}(\lambda f).$$

Then

$$(-\Delta)^s u_{k+1} = |\nabla u_k|^q + \lambda f \text{ in } I\!R^N.$$

We claim that

$$|\nabla u_k| \le C_1 I_{2s-1}(\lambda f), \tag{5.7}$$

$$|\nabla u_{k+1} - \nabla u_k| \le C_2 \delta^k I_{2s-1}(\lambda f) \text{ for some } \delta < 1, \tag{5.8}$$

and the sequence $\{u_k\}_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in the space $D^{1,\gamma}(I\!R^N)$ where $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)} \ge q$.

We prove first (5.7) arguing by induction. It is clear that (5.7) holds for $k = 1$. Assume that

$$|\nabla u_k| \le a_k I_{2s-1}(f),$$

then we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla u_{k+1}| &= |\nabla(I_{2s}(|\nabla u_k|^q)) + \nabla(I_{2s}(f))| \\ &\le C\Big(I_{2s-1}(|\nabla u_k|^q) + I_{2s-1}(f)\Big) \\ &\le C\Big(a_k^q I_{2s-1}((f_0)^q) + I_{2s-1}(f)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Now using (5.2) we conclude that

$$|\nabla u_{k+1}| \le a_{k+1} I_{2s-1}(f)$$

where

$$a_{k+1} = C(C_1 a_k^q + 1).$$

Then, if $C_1 \le \dfrac{q'^{1-q}}{qC^q}$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} a_k = a \le Cq',$$

where a the smaller root to the equation $x = C(C_1 x^q + 1)$. Hence (5.7) follows.

As a conclusion and using the same computation as in the last part of the proof of Theorem 5.1 we reach that the sequence $\{u_k\}_k$ is bounded in the space $D^{1,\gamma}(I\!R^N)$ where $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)}$. Now using estimate (5.7) we reach that $\{u_k\}_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in $D^{1,\gamma}$. Hence we get the existence of $u \in D^{1,\gamma}$ such that $u_k \to u$ strongly in $D^{1,\gamma}(I\!R^N)$. Since $q < \gamma$, then $u_k \to u$ strongly in $W^{1,q}_{loc}(I\!R^N)$ and then u solves (4.1) at least in the sense of distributions. □

5.1. **The subcritical case $q < 2s$.** In this subsection we consider the case $q < 2s$. We will combine the above ideas in order to show the existence of a *suitable supersolution* under *natural* condition on f. Then using the comparison principle and the representation formula, as in the previous section, we show the existence of a minimal solution. More precisely we have the next result.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that $q < 2s$. Suppose that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ where $m > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$ and the hypothesis (5.2) holds. There there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ problem (4.1) has a solution u such that $u \in W^{1,q}_0(\Omega)$ and $T_k(u) \in H^s_0(\Omega) \cap W^{1,\sigma}_0(\Omega)$ for all $\sigma < 2s$.*

Proof. We follow closely the argument used in the proof of Theorem 4.3. Let u_n to be the unique solution to the approximated problem (4.4), then $u_n \le u_{n+1}$. Fix $\lambda < \lambda^*$ defined in (5.4) and let $\hat{u}$ be the supersolution obtained in Theorem 5.1. It is clear that $\hat{u}$ is a supersolution to problem (4.4). Hence by the comparison principle in Theorem (3.1) we reach that $u_n \le \hat{u}$ for all n. Hence following the same computation as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^\alpha &\le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q \Big(\int_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y) \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x) dx \Big) dy \\ &+ \lambda \int_\Omega f(y) \Big(\int_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y) \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x) dx \Big) dy. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Now, we divide the proof into two cases, according to the value of m and the regularity of $\hat{u}$.

The first case: $\frac{N}{2s} < m$. In this case, using Proposition 1 we know that $\hat{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Hence following again the proof of Theorem 4.1 and taking into consideration (5.9), we conclude that $\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^\alpha \le C$ for all n provided that $\alpha < 2s$. Now the rest of the proof follows exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

The second case: $\frac{N}{q'(2s-1)} < m \le \frac{N}{2s}$. Since $q \ge p_*$, then using Lemma 2.6, we obtain that $|\nabla \hat{u}| \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$ where $\gamma = \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)} > q$.

We set

$$K(y) = \int_\Omega h^\alpha(x,y) \mathcal{G}_s(x,y) \hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x) dx,$$

then by (5.9) we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|^\alpha \le \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n(y)|^q K(y) dy + \lambda \int_\Omega f(y) K(y) dy. \tag{5.10}$$

We claim that for $q < \alpha < \alpha_0$ defined in Proposition 1, we have $K \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Notice that

$$K(y) \le \int_\Omega \frac{\hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x) G(x,y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dx + \int_\Omega \frac{\hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x) G(x,y)}{d^\alpha(x)} dx = J_1 + J_2.$$

It is clear that

$$J_1 \leq \int_\Omega \frac{\hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}}dx.$$

Hence by second point in Proposition 1 we obtain that $\int_\Omega \frac{\hat{u}^{\alpha-1}(x)}{|x-y|^{N-2s+\alpha}}dx \leq C$. Thus $J_1(y) \leq C$. To analyze J_2, we follow the same computation as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. As a consequence we reach that $J_2 \leq C$. Therefore we conclude that $K(y) \leq C$ for all $y \in \Omega$ and the claim follows.

Following again the last part of the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get the existence of a solution u to problem (4.1) such that $u \leq \hat{u}$, $u \in W_0^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for all $\alpha < \alpha_0$ and $T_k(u) \in H_0^s(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,\sigma}(\Omega)$ for all $\sigma < 2s$. It is clear that u is a minimal solution to (4.1). □

We give now a capacity-based condition on f in order to show that condition (5.2) holds. Let recall the following result proved in [33].

Theorem 5.4. *Assume that $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a nonnegative function. For any compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we define $|E|_f = \int_E f(y)dy$.*

Then f satisfies the condition (5.2), if and only if, for any compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$|E|_f \leq C\, cap_{2s-1,q'}(E) \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$cap_{2s-1,q'}(E) \equiv \inf\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\phi(x)-\phi(y)|^{q'}}{|x-y|^{N+q'(2s-1)}}dxdy \text{ where } \phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and } \phi \geq \chi_E \right\}.$$

As a consequence we have the following result.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ with $m \geq \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$ and define f_0 as in (5.1). Then the condition (5.2) holds for f_0.*

Proof. We have just to show that the condition (5.11) holds. Let E be a compact set and consider $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be such that $\phi \geq \chi_E$. Using Hölder inequality

$$|E|_{f_0} \leq \int_E f_0|\phi|^{q'}dx \leq \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_0^{\frac{p_{s_1}^*}{p_{s_1}^*-p}}\Big)^{\frac{p_{s_1}^*-p}{p_{s_1}^*}} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|\phi(x)|^{p_{s_1}^*}\Big)^{\frac{p}{p_{s_1}^*}}$$

where $p = q', s_1 = 2s-1$ and $p_{s_1}^* = \frac{pN}{N-ps_1}$. It is clear that $\frac{p_{s_1}^*}{p_{s_1}^*-p} = \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$. Since $m \geq \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$, then

$$|E|_{f_0} \leq C(\Omega)||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}\mathrm{cap}_{2s-1,q'}(E).$$

Hence we conclude. □

5.2. **The critical case $q = 2s$.** In this case there are difficulties to use the comparison arguments. It is possible to find a supersolution but it is not clear how to pass to the limit in the gradient term when dealing with the family of approximating problems.

In the local case this difficulty is overpassed by using convenient nonlinear test functions and a suitable change of variable. In the nonlocal framework it seems to be necessary to change this point of view and to adapt a different approach. We will use in a convenient way the Schauder fixed point theorem following the strategy used recently in [35] and [34] for the local case.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that Ω is a bounded regular domain and that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ where $m > \frac{N}{2s}$. Then there exists $\lambda^*(f) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < \lambda^*$, problem (4.1) has a solution $u \in W_0^{1,2s}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ where $m > \frac{N}{2s}$. We know by Lemma 2.10 that if v is a solution to problem (2.17), then for all $p < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)}$, there exists a positive constant C_0 such that

$$||\nabla v||_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_0 ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}. \tag{5.12}$$

Since $m > \frac{N}{2s}$, then $\sigma_0 \equiv 2sm < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)}$. Now, taking into account that $2s > 1$, we can chose $\lambda^* > 0$ such that for some $l > 0$, we have

$$C_0(l + \lambda^* ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}) = l^{\frac{1}{2s}}.$$

Fix $\delta > 0$ small enough to be chosen later, $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and $l > 0$ as above. We define the set

$$E = \{v \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) : v \in W_0^{1,2s(1+\delta)}(\Omega) \text{ and } ||\nabla v||_{L^{2sm}} \leq l^{\frac{1}{2s}}\}. \tag{5.13}$$

It is easy to check that E is a closed convex set of $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Consider the operator

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T : E & \to & W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \\ v & \to & T(v) = u \end{array}$$

where u is the unique solution to problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} (-\Delta)^s u & = & |\nabla v|^{2s} + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u & = & 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \\ u & > & 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{5.14}$$

Since $|\nabla v|^{2s} + \lambda f \in L^1(\Omega)$, then the existence of u is a consequence of Theorem 2.5. and moreover $|\nabla u| \in L^q(\Omega)$ for all $q < p_* = \frac{N}{N-2s+1}$. Hence T is well defined.

We claim that:

(1) For $\delta > 0$ small enough, $T(E) \subset E$,
(2) T is a continuous and compact operator on E.

Proof of (1). Since $\sigma_0 = 2sm < \frac{mN}{N-m(2s-1)}$, by using Lemma 2.10, it follows that

$$||\nabla u||_{L^{\sigma_0}(\Omega)} \leq C_0 \left|\left| |\nabla v|^{2s} + \lambda f \right|\right|_{L^m(\Omega)}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{array}{rcl} ||\nabla u||_{L^{\sigma_0}(\Omega)} & \leq & C_0 \left(\left|\left| |\nabla v|^{2s} \right|\right|_{L^m(\Omega)} + \lambda ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)} \right) \\ & \leq & C_0 (||\nabla v||^{2s}_{L^{2sm}(\Omega)} + \lambda ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}) \\ & \leq & C_0 (l + \lambda^* ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}) = l^{\frac{1}{2s}}. \end{array}$$

It is clear that for δ small, $2s(1+\delta) < 2sm$. Hence $u \in E$.

Proof of (2). To show the continuity of T respect to the topology of $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$, we consider $\{v_n\}_n \subset E$ such that $v_n \to v$ strongly in $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Define $u_n = T(v_n), u = T(v)$.

We have to show that $u_n \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$; to do this we prove that

$$||\nabla v_n - \nabla v||_{L^{2s}(\Omega)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Recall that $\{v_n\}_n \subset E$ and $||v_n - v||_{W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then $\nabla v_n \to \nabla v$ strongly in $(L^1(\Omega))^N$ and $||\nabla v_n||_{L^{2sm}(\Omega)} \leq l^{\frac{1}{2s}}$.

Since $2sm > 1$, then setting $a = \frac{2s(m-1)}{2sm-1} < 1$, it follows that $\frac{2s-a}{1-a} = 2sm$. Hence by Hölder inequality, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} ||\nabla v_n - \nabla v||_{L^{2s}(\Omega)} &\leq ||\nabla v_n - \nabla v||^{\frac{a}{2s}}_{L^1(\Omega)} ||\nabla v_n - \nabla v||^{\frac{2s-a}{2s}}_{L^{\frac{2s-a}{1-a}}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C||\nabla v_n - \nabla v||^{\frac{a}{2s}}_{L^1(\Omega)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the definition of u_n and u, there results that $u_n \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$. Thus T is continuous.

To finish we have just to show that T is compact respect to the topology of $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

Let $\{v_n\}_n \subset E$ be such that $||v_n||_{W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)} \leq C$. Since $\{v_n\}_n \subset E$, then $||\nabla v_n||_{L^{2s(1+\delta)}(\Omega)} \leq C$ and therefore up to a subsequence, $v_{n_k} \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $W_0^{1,2s(1+\delta)}(\Omega)$.

Define

$$F_n = |\nabla v_n|^{2s} + \lambda f, F = |\nabla v|^{2s} + \lambda f,$$

it is clear that F_n is bounded in $L^{1+\delta}(\Omega)$ and $F_n \rightharpoonup F$ weakly in $L^{1+\delta}(\Omega)$. Using the compactness result of [15], we conclude that, up to a subsequence, $u_{n_k} \to u$ strongly in $W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$, hence the claim follows.

As a conclusion and using the Schauder Fixed Point Theorem, there exists $u \in E$ such that $T(u) = u$, then $u \in W_0^{1,2s}(\Omega)$ and u solves (4.1). □

Remark 5.

(1) *The solution obtained above is the unique solution in E. Indeed, assume u_1 and $u_2 \in E$ solutions to problem (4.1). Therefore, in particular, $||\nabla u_1||_{L^{2sm}} < \infty$ and $||\nabla u_2||_{L^{2sm}} < \infty$. Define $w = u_1 - u_2$, then $||\nabla w||_{L^{2sm}} < \infty$ and w solves the problem*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w &= |\nabla u_1|^{2s} - |\nabla u_2|^{2s} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Setting $b(x) = |\nabla u_1|^{2s-1} + |\nabla u_2|^{2s-1}$, the following inequality holds

$$(-\Delta)^s w \leq 2sb(x)|\nabla w| \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Since $m > \frac{N}{2s}$, then $b \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for $\sigma > \frac{N}{2s-1}$. By using the comparison principle in Theorem 3.1, it follows that $w_+ = 0$. Thus $u_1 \leq u_2$. In a similar way we get $u_2 \leq u_1$. Hence $u_1 = u_2$.

(2) *The solution $u \in E$ is the minimal solution to problem (4.1). Assume that v is an other solution to (4.1), then $v \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ and $(-\Delta)^s v \in L^1(\Omega)$. As above, setting $w = u - v$ and using the fact that for all $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for all $\alpha > 1$, we have*

$$|\xi_1|^\alpha - |\xi_2|^\alpha \leq \alpha|\xi_1|^{\alpha-2}\langle \xi_1, \xi_1 - \xi_2\rangle,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s w &= |\nabla u|^{2s} - |\nabla v|^{2s} \leq 2s|\nabla u|^{2s-1}|\nabla w| & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Setting $b(x) = |\nabla u|^{2s-1}$ and using the fact that $u \in E$, there results that $b \in L^\sigma(\Omega)$ for $\sigma = \frac{2sm}{2s-1} > \frac{N}{2s-1}$. As above, using the comparison principle in Theorem 3.1, we conclude that $w_+ = 0$. Hence $u \leq v$.

5.3. **The supercritical case $q > 2s$.** In a similar way as in the critical case, we can handle the supercritical case, $q > 2s$ and prove the following result.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose that Ω is a bounded regular domain and that $f \in L^m(\Omega)$ where $m > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$. Then there exists $\lambda^*(f) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda < \lambda^*$, problem (4.1) has a solution $u \in W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. In this case we choose $l > 0$ and σ_0 such that

$$\sigma_0 \equiv 2sm < \frac{mN}{N - m(2s-1)} \text{ and } C_0(l + \lambda^* ||f||_{L^m(\Omega)}) = l^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Define the set

$$E = \{v \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) : v \in W_0^{1,q(1+\delta)}(\Omega) \text{ and } ||\nabla v||_{L^{qm}} \leq l^{\frac{1}{q}}\}. \tag{5.15}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 5.6 we consider $T_q : E \to W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ defined by $u = T_q(v)$ where u is the unique solution to problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u &= |\nabla v|^q + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \\ u &> 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{5.16}$$

By similar computations as in the proof of Theorem 5.6 and for $\lambda < \lambda^*(f)$ fixed, we can prove that T_q has a fixed point in E_q and then problem (4.1) has a solution $u \in E_q$. □

Remark 6. *As in the case $q = 2s$, since $m > \frac{N}{q'(2s-1)}$, by the same kind of arguments as in Remark 5, it holds that problem (4.1) has a unique positive solution in the convex set E_q that is the minimal solution of (4.1).*

6. Some open problems

The regularity result proved in Lemma 2.10 is the key in order to show the existence results and it is worthy point out that it depends directly on the representation formula given in (2.16) and in the pointwise estimates on the Green function G_s.

With the previous remark in mind we can formulate the following open problems that should be interesting to solve.

(1) Let consider the operator L_k defined by

$$L_k(u) = P.V \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(x) - u(y))k(x,y)\, dy,$$

where k is a suitable symmetric function. Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} L_k(u) &= |\nabla u|^p + \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \\ u &> 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

It seems to be interesting to find conditions on L_k in order to find the same kind of regularity results, for instance, getting estimates without the explicit representation formula.

(2) In the local case $s = 1$ and for the critical exponent $q = 2$, an exponential regularity is obtained for any solution to problem (4.1). See [2]. Precisely the result is that any positive solution satisfies $e^{\alpha u} - 1 \in W_0^{1,2}$ for all $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. It seems to be natural to ask for the optimal regularity in the fractional case.

(3) Consider the nonlinear operator

$$(-\Delta_p^s)\, u(x) := P.V \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x)-u(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}\, dy$$

with $1 < p < N$ and $s \in (0,1)$, then as it was proved in [1], the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta_p^s)u &= f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } I\!R^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a unique entropy solution for nonnegative datum. It seems to be interesting to show the regularity of $|\nabla u|$ if $sp' > \frac{(2-p)N}{p-1} + 1$ and to consider the nonlinear nonlocal version of problem (1.1).

(4) A problem with nonlocal diffusion and nonlocal growth term could be formulated for all $s \in (0,1)$ and it should be interesting to analyze it in detail.

References

[1] B. Abdellaoui, A. Attar, R. Bentifour, *On the fractional p-laplacian equations with weights and general datum*. Submitted, available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1601.00606

[2] B. Abdellaoui, A. Dall'Aglio, and I. Peral, *Some remarks on elliptic problems with critical growth in the gradient*. J. Differential Equations **222** (2006), 21-62.

[3] N.E. Alaa, M. Pierre, *Weak solutions of some quasilinear elliptic equations with data measures* SIAM J. Math. Anal., **24**, (1993), 23-35.

[4] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.-P. Puel, *Existence des solutions non bornées pour certains équations quasi-linéaires*, Portugal Math. **41** (1982), 507-534.

[5] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.-P. Puel, *Existence de solutions faibles pour des équations elliptiques quasi-linéaires à croissance quadratique*, in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and their Applications, Collège de France Seminar, Vol. IV (J.-L. Lions and H. Brezis, eds.), Research Notes in Math, **84**, Pitman, London, 1983, 19-73.

[6] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.-P. Puel, *Resultats d'existence pour certains problèmes elliptiques quasi-linéaires*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa **11**, no. 2 (1984), 213-235.

[7] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.-P. Puel, *Existence of bounded solutions for nonlinear elliptic unilateral problems*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **152**, (1988), 183-196.

[8] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.-P. Puel, *L^∞ estimates for some nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations and application to an existence result*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **2**, (1992), 326-333

[9] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, L. Orsina, *Existence and nonexistence of solutions for some nonlinear elliptic equations,* J. Anal. Math. 73 (1997), 203-223.

[10] K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, A. Nowak, *Gradient estimates for harmonic and q−harmonic funcitons of Symmetric stable processes,* Illinois J. Math. 46 (2002) no 2, 541-556 .

[11] K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, M. Kwaśnicki, *Estimates and structure of a-harmonic functions*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 140 (2008), 345-381.

[12] K. Bogdan, T. Jakubowski, *Estimates of the Green Function for the Fractional Laplacian Perturbed by Gradient*, Potential Anal 36 (2012), 455-481.

[13] H. Brezis, X. Cabré, *Some Simple Nonlinear PDE's Without Solution,* Boll. Unione. Mat. Ital. Sez. B Vol 8 No 1 (1998), 223-262.

[14] Z. Chen, R. Song, *Estimates on Green functions and Poisson kernels for symmetric stable process,* Math. Ann. 312, (1998), 465-501.

[15] H. Chen, L. Veron, *Semilinear fractional elliptic equations involving measures*, J. Differential Equations 257 (2014) 1457-1486.

[16] H. Chen, L. Veron, *Semilinear fractional elliptic equations with gradient nonlinearity involving measures.* Journal of Functional Analysis 266 (2014) 5467-5492.

[17] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, E. Valdinoci, *Hitchhiker's guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces*, Bull. Sci. math. **136** (2012), no. 5, 521-573.

[18] V. Ferone, F. Murat, *Quasilinear problems having quadratic growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source term is small*, Equations aux dérivées partielles et applications, 497-515, Gauthier-Villars, Ed. Sci. Méd. Elsevier, Paris, 1998.

[19] V. Ferone, F. Murat, *Nonlinear problems having natural growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source terms are small*, Nonlinear Anal. T.M.A. **42**, no. 7 (2000), 1309-1326.
[20] F. Ferrari, I. Verbitsky, *Radial fractional Laplace operators and Hessian inequalities*, J. Differential Equations 253 (2012), no. 1, 244-272.
[21] R. L. Frank, E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, *Hardy-Lieb-Thirring inequalities for fractional Schrödinger operators*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **21** (2008), 925–950.
[22] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Reprint of the 1998 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
[23] N. Grenon, F. Murat, A. Porretta, *Existence and a priori estimate for elliptic problems with subquadratic gradient dependent terms*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **342** (2006), 23–28.
[24] M. Hairer, *Solving the KPZ equation*, Annals of Mathematics 178 (2013), 559-664.
[25] K. Hansson, V.G. Maz'ya, I.E. Verbitsky, *Criteria of solvability for multidimensional Riccati equations*, Ark. Mat., **37**, (1999), 87-120.
[26] G. Karch, W.A. Woyczyński, *Fractal Hamilton-Jacobi-KPZ equations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360 (2008), no. 5, 2423-2442.
[27] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, Y.C. Zhang, *Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, (1986), 889-892.
[28] M. Kassmann, *A priori estimates for integro-differential operators with measurable kernels*, Calc. Var., 34 (2009), 1–21.
[29] T. Leonori, I. Peral, A. Primo, F. Soria, *Basic estimates for solution of elliptic and parabolic equations for a class of nonlocal operators*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems- A, 35 (2015) no 12 6031-6068.
[30] E.H. Lieb, *Sharp Constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and Related Inequalities* , Annals of Mathematics, Vol. 118, No. 2, (1983), 349-374.
[31] E.H. Lieb. M. Loss, *Analysis* Graduate Studies in Mathematics Volume 14, American Mathematical Society. Providence, R.I., 2001.
[32] M. Loss, C. Sloane, *Hardy inequalities for fractional integrals on general domains*, Journal of Functional Analysis Vol. 259, No 6, (2010), 1369-1379.
[33] V.G. Maz'ya, I.E. Verbitsky, *Capacitary estimates for fractional integrals, with applications to partial differential equations and Sobolev multipliers,* Ark. Mat. 33 (1995), 81-115.
[34] T. Mengesha, P. Nguyen Cong *Quasilinear Riccati type equations with distributional data in Morrey space framework.* J. Differential Equations 260 (2016), no. 6, 5421-5449.
[35] P. Nguyen Cong, *Morrey global bounds and qusilinear Riccarti type equation bellow the natural exponent*, J. math. Pures Appl. 102, (2014), 99-123.
[36] A. Porretta, *Elliptic equations with first order terms*, the Ecole CIMPA at Alexandria (Egypt), 2009.
[37] G. Stampacchia, *Le problème de Dirichlet pour les équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), **15** (1965), 189-258.
[38] E. M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J. 1970.
[39] W. A. Woyczyński, *Burgers-KPZ turbulence*. Göttingen lectures. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1700. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998

B. Abdellaoui, Laboratoire d'Analyse Nonlinéaire et Mathématiques Appliquées.
Département de Mathématiques, Université Abou Bakr Belkaïd, Tlemcen,
Tlemcen 13000, Algeria.

I. Peral, Departamento de Matemáticas,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
28049, Madrid, Spain.

E-mail addresses:
boumediene.abdellaoui@inv.uam.es, ireneo.peral@uam.es.